you would be a fair and impartial juror. Thank you. We now have a jury.

I want to thank those of you who were not selected for coming today. It is impossible to determine at the outset how many prospective jurors must be questioned before a jury can finally be impaneled. Jury service is one of the most important activities of being a United States citizen. The Court very much appreciates your willingness to serve. Even though you might not have been selected to serve on this jury, your participation in the jury selection process has been a very important contribution to the workings of this court.

Those of you not selected are excused and may now leave the courtroom. Thank you all very much.

(Unselected members of the jury panel leave the courtroom.)

Mr. Snyder, would you please swear in the jury?

(Courtroom deputy swears the jury panel.)

THE COURT: Okay. Now, before any of you faint from starvation, I'm going to tell you I'm going to let you go in about a minute to go eat lunch, and, when you get back, I'm going to give preliminary instructions, and then we'll have opening statements.

Steve Snyder, my courtroom deputy, will also be your caretaker, and we want to try to make this as

comfortable and enjoyable an experience for you as we possibly can. He'll tell you a few things in the jury room.

I'll give you a little preview of the case when you get back, and then you will hear one of the most enjoyable parts of the case, which is opening statements.

And, then if we have time, we will start with witnesses.

Let's stand in recess until -- why don't we stand in recess until 3 o'clock? I think that will give you an hour and 20 minutes, and Steve has got to talk to you for a few minutes, and the restaurants won't be busy at all at this time of day. So we will reconvene at 3 p.m.

(Jury excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Ms. Cross or Mr. Thapar, I understand there is a matter that you wanted to bring to the Court's attention.

MS. CROSS: Yes, Your Honor. This morning, in preparing for trial, we have all of our witnesses present in the courthouse. We have excused some of them because of the timing. And during the time that one of our witnesses was leaving the courthouse, she was threatened by members of the defendants' family, and we wanted to bring that to the attention of the Court. And this threat was overheard by Bonnie Silva, who is our victim-witness coordinator in the U.S. Attorney's Office.

THE COURT: Who was the witness, Ms. Cross? 1 2 MS. CROSS: The witness is Shanell Holston. Is she still going to testify? 3 THE COURT: 4 MS. CROSS: Yes. THE COURT: What do you propose that the Court 5 do? 6 7 MS. CROSS: Admonish members of the defendants' family, who I believe are here and will be sitting in the 8 courtroom during the trial. I don't know if they're going 9 10 to be called as witnesses or not, but I anticipate them 11 being in the trial, in the hallway and around some of our 12 witnesses. THE COURT: All right. Well, we don't have too 13 many spectators in the court right now. I'm not quite sure 14 who are relatives or not, but let me inform everybody, and 15 I don't know if the defendants have an opportunity to talk 16 17 to their family or not, but, if there is any hint 18 whatsoever of any kind of intimidation of any witnesses, 19 the Court will not hesitate to impose the most severe 20 sanctions it can. I will not hesitate to call the FBI 21 immediately and have them investigate the matter. And, in 22 fact, when the Court goes back to chambers right now, 23 that's what I intend to do is call the FBI and have them 24 come over and investigate this matter immediately. 25 So I want to put everybody on notice. This is a

```
very severe thing to do, and the Court will not stand for
1
2
     intimidation of any witnesses or jurors or anyone else
     involved in this case.
 3
               Anything further to come before the Court at this
4
5
     time?
               MS. CROSS: No, Your Honor.
6
7
               THE COURT: All right. We will stand in recess
8
     until 3 p.m.
9
               Oh, I'm sorry. Let me ask one question.
10
     are we doing on opening statements? Mr. Thapar, you're
     making it for the government?
11
12
               MR. THAPAR: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: What are we doing for the defense?
13
               MR. FELSON: I have a brief opening. I don't
14
15
     know if Mr. Walter Pugh wants to add something to it.
16
               DEFENDANT W. PUGH: Yes. I have a brief opening.
17
               THE COURT: So Mr. Felson will go first.
18
               MR. FELSON: That would be fine.
19
               THE COURT: I don't care. Just tell me the
20
     order. You're going to go first and then Walter Pugh?
21
               DEFENDANT W. PUGH: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. We'll stand in
23
     recess until 3 p.m.
24
               (Recess at 1:43 p.m.)
25
                         AFTERNOON SESSION
```

(Jury present.)

again to federal district court. And just as a personal aside, this is the first time we have used my courtroom since it was totally remodeled. The jury box used to seat six, and it now seats 14. Unfortunately, we don't have the regular jury chairs in yet. We are still waiting for those. So, if anybody has a problem with any of those chairs, let us know, and we will see what we can do to get you something else more comfortable.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the following remarks are intended to serve as your introduction to the trial in which you're participating. These are not intended to act as a substitute for the detailed instructions on the law that I will give you at the end of the case before you retire to deliberate. Rather, these remarks are a simple explanation of your duties and responsibilities and the basic principles of law that are likely to be involved in the case.

Your purpose as jurors is to find and determine the facts. Under our system of criminal procedure, you are the sole judges of the facts.

If at any time I should make any comment regarding the facts, you are at liberty to disregard it.

It is especially important that you perform your duties of

determining the facts diligently and conscientiously, for ordinarily there is no means of correcting an erroneous determination of the facts by a jury.

On the other hand and with equal emphasis, I instruct you that the law as given by the Court constitutes the only law for your guidance. It is your duty to follow the law as I give it to you, even though you may disagree with the law.

Let me talk just a little bit about note taking by you. If you want to take notes during the course of the trial, you may do so. There should be -- are we doing envelopes this time or just notepads?

Okay. We have given you notepads with a pen for you to use if you like. However, I want you to remember that it's difficult to take detailed notes and pay attention to what the witnesses are saying at the same time. If you do take notes, be sure that your taking of notes does not interfere with your listening to and considering all the evidence. Also, if you do take notes, please do not discuss them with anyone before you begin your deliberations.

Do not take the notes home with you at the end of the day. Be sure to leave them in the jury room.

If you choose not to take notes, remember that it is your own individual responsibility to listen carefully

to the evidence. You cannot give this responsibility to someone who is taking notes. Those should only be used to refresh the recollection of the juror who took the notes. You should not use your notes in jury deliberations to prove to other jurors that your notes are in fact what a witness actually said. It is only your impression of what the witness said. We depend on the judgment of all members of the jury. You're all responsible for remembering the evidence in this case. Remember that notes are only aids to memory and should not be given precedence over your own independent recollection of the facts.

You must not allow your note taking to distract your attention from the proceedings.

You will notice that we do have an official court reporter making a record of the trial. However, we will not have typewritten transcripts of the record available for your use in reaching your decision in the case.

Let me talk with you a little bit about the facts that are to be determined from the evidence. You are to determine the facts in this case solely from the evidence, which consists of the testimony of witnesses and the exhibits received in evidence. Questions asked by the lawyers and Mr. Pugh, who is representing himself, are not evidence. Only the answers given by the witnesses are evidence. Statements and arguments made by the attorneys

and Walter Pugh are not evidence, even when he represents himself.

They may, however, the parties and counsel, enter into what are called agreements or stipulations of fact that are not disputed, and in this case they have done that. And with regard to stipulations, you're to accept the agreed upon facts as evidence.

You are to consider only the evidence in the case, but, in your consideration of the evidence, you are not limited to the bald statements of the witnesses. In other words, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You are permitted to draw from the facts which you decide have been proven such reasonable inferences as you feel are justified in light of your experience.

You must not consider as evidence anything you may have read or heard about the case outside the courtroom, whether before or during the trial.

Let me talk a little bit about direct and circumstantial evidence. Some of you may have heard the terms "direct evidence" and "circumstantial evidence."

Direct evidence is simply the testimony -- I'm sorry.

Direct evidence is simply evidence like the testimony of an eye witness which, if you believe it, directly proves a fact. If a witness came in here and testified that he saw

it raining outside, that would be direct evidence that it was raining.

Circumstantial evidence is simply a chain of circumstances that indirectly proves a fact. If someone walked into the courtroom carrying a raincoat covered with drops of water and carrying a wet umbrella, that would be circumstantial evidence from which you could conclude it was raining.

It is your job to decide how much weight to give the direct and circumstantial evidence. The law makes no distinction between the weight you should give to either one, nor does it say one is any better evidence than the other. You should consider all the evidence, both direct and circumstantial, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves.

Next I want to talk a little bit about credibility of witnesses. Another part of your jobs as jurors is to decide how credible or believable each witness is. This is your job, not mine. It is up to you to decide if a witness' testimony was believable and how much weight you think it deserves. You are free to believe everything that a witness said or only part of it or none of it at all. But you should act reasonably and carefully in making these decisions.

Let me suggest some things for you to consider in

1 evaluating each witness' testimony. Ask yourself if the 2 witness was able to clearly see or hear the events. Sometimes even an honest witness may not have been able to 3 clearly see or hear what was happening and may make a 4 mistake. 5 Ask yourself how good the witness' memory seemed 6 to be. Did the witness seem to be able to accurately 7 remember what happened? 8 Ask yourself if there was anything else that may 9 have interfered with the witness' ability to perceive the 10 events. 11 Ask yourself how the witness acted while 12 testifying. Did the witness appear to be honest, or did 13 the witness appear to be lying? 14 Ask yourself if the witness had any relationship 15 with the government or either of the defendants or anything 16 to gain or lose from the case that may have influenced the 17 witness' testimony. 18 Ask yourself if the witness had any bias or 19 20 prejudice that would cause the witness to lie or slant 21 testimony for one side or the other. 22 Ask yourself if the witness testified 23 inconsistently while on the witness stand or if the witness 24 said or did something at any other time that is

inconsistent with what the witness said while testifying.

25

If you believe that a witness was inconsistent, ask yourself if this makes the witness' testimony less believable. Sometimes it may. Other times it may not.

Consider whether the inconsistency was about something important or about some unimportant detail. Ask yourself if it seemed like an innocent mistake or if it seemed deliberate.

And ask yourself how believable the witness' testimony is in light of all the other evidence. Was the witness' testimony supported or contradicted by other evidence that you found believable. If you believe that a witness' testimony was contradicted by other evidence, remember that people sometimes forget things and that even two honest people who witnessed the same event may not describe it exactly the same way.

Those are only some of the things you may consider in deciding how believable each witness was. You may also consider other things that you think shed some light on the witness' believability.

Use your common sense and your everyday experience in dealing with other people and then decide what testimony you believe and how much weight you think it deserves.

Some evidence is admitted for a limited purpose only. When I instruct you that an item of evidence has

1.3

been admitted for a limited purpose, you must consider it only for that limited purpose and no other.

Let me talk just a little bit about my conduct. No statement, ruling or remark or comment that I may make during the course of the trial is intended to indicate my opinion as to how you should decide the case or influence you in any way in your determination of the facts.

At times, I may ask questions of witnesses. If I do so, it's for the purpose of bringing out matters which I feel should be brought out and not in any way to indicate my opinion about the facts or indicate the weight I feel you should give to the testimony of the witness.

I may also find it necessary to admonish the lawyers. If I do, you should not show prejudice toward a lawyer or his client because I found it necessary to admonish him or her.

During the trial, it may be necessary for me to confer with the lawyers from time to time out of your hearing concerning questions of law or procedure that require consideration by the Court alone. And so you may be excused from the courtroom as a convenience to you and us while we discuss such matters. We will try to limit such interruptions as much as possible, but you should remember at all times the importance of the matter we're here to determine and be patient even though the case may

The parties may present objections to some of the testimony or other evidence. It is the duty of a lawyer or a defendant representing himself to object to the evidence that he or she believes may not properly be offered. And you should not be prejudiced in any way against the lawyer or a defendant who makes objections or the party he or she represents.

At times, I may sustain objections or direct that you disregard certain testimony or exhibits. You must not consider any evidence to which an objection has been sustained or that I have instructed you to disregard.

Let me talk a little bit about what's called a pro se defendant. That's a defendant who represents himself. Although he has the constitutional right to be represented by counsel, Defendant Walter Pugh has exercised his constitutional right not to be represented by counsel and to represent himself in this proceeding. His decision to represent himself is not to be considered as a factor for or against him.

Next I want to talk about the presumption of innocence, the burden of proof, and what we call reasonable doubt.

The defendants have pled not guilty to the crimes charged in the indictment. The indictment is not any

evidence at all of guilt. It is just the formal way that the government tells the defendants what crimes they are accused of committing. It does not even raise any suspicion of guilt.

Instead, the defendants start the trial with a clean slate with no evidence at all against them, and the law presumes that they are innocent. This presumption of innocence stays with them unless the government presents evidence here in court that overcomes the presumption and convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt that they are guilty. This means that the defendants have no obligation to present any evidence at all or to prove to you in any way that they are innocent. It is up to the government to prove that they are guilty, and this burden stays on the government from start to finish. You must find the defendants not guilty unless the government convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt that they are guilty.

The government must prove every element of the crimes charged beyond a reasonable doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt. Possible doubts or doubts based purely on speculation are not reasonable doubts.

A reasonable doubt is based upon reason and common sense. It may arise from the evidence, the lack of evidence or the nature of the evidence. Proof beyond a

reasonable doubt means proof that is so convincing that you would not hesitate to rely and act on it in making the most important decisions in your own lives. If you are convinced that the government has proved the defendants guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, say so by returning a guilty verdict. If you are not convinced, say so by returning a not guilty verdict.

Let me talk a little bit about the charges in the case. The defendants Walter M. Pugh, Jr. and Tyreese D. Pugh have been charged in a five-count indictment. Count one charges both defendants with conspiring to take by force or violence money belonging to a bank whose deposits were then insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and in committing such offense were assaulting or putting in jeopardy the life of another person by use of a dangerous weapon.

The defendants have pled not guilty to count one. For you to find the defendants guilty of count one, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the government has proven every element of the above violation.

Count two charges both defendants with taking by force or violence money belonging to a bank whose deposits were then insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and in committing such offense were assaulting or putting in jeopardy the life of another person by use of

a dangerous weapon.

The defendants have pled not guilty to count two.

For you to find the defendants guilty of count two, you

must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the

qovernment has proven every element of the above violation.

Count three charges Defendant Walter Pugh with knowingly using, carrying and brandishing a firearm during a crime of violence for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States.

Defendant Walter Pugh has pled not guilty to count three. For you to find Defendant Walter Pugh guilty of count three, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the government has proven every element of the above violation.

Count four charges Defendant Tyreese Pugh with knowingly using, carrying and brandishing a firearm during a crime of violence for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States.

The Defendant Tyreese Pugh has pled not guilty as to count four. For you to find him guilty of count four, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the government has proven every element of the above violation.

And finally, count five charges the Defendant

Tyreese Pugh with knowing possession in and affecting

commerce of a firearm while he was a convicted felon.

Defendant Tyreese Pugh has pled not guilty to count five. For you to find Defendant Tyreese Pugh guilty of count five, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the government has proven every element of the above violation.

Let me talk now a little bit about what the jury does in terms of conduct. Do not decide any issue or form any opinion in this case until you have heard all the evidence, been instructed by the Court on the law and retired to the jury room to deliberate. Until the case is submitted to you, you are not to discuss this case with anyone, not even your fellow jurors. Likewise, it would be improper for you to allow anyone to discuss the case in your presence. You must not talk to the parties, the lawyers or the witnesses under any circumstances.

Since you must keep an open mind until you're instructed by the Court to begin your deliberations, it is important that you do not read newspaper articles or listen to radio or TV broadcasts about the case. And I'm not saying that there will be any, but, just in case, I want to caution you about that.

I would suggest that, when you arrive at home, you simply tell your family that you're sitting on a jury in federal court and that you will be glad to talk with them about the case as soon as the jury has a verdict.

After the case is submitted to you, you must discuss it only in the jury room with your fellow jurors. Should anyone improperly approach you concerning the case, you should promptly report it to the United States Marshal or to the Court.

I do not anticipate that there will be any such approaches, but even inadvertent statements in your presence dealing with the trial should immediately be brought to the Court's attention. Likewise, should you inadvertently read, see or hear anything in the media concerning the case, you should inform the Court.

Now, just a few more words about your conduct as jurors. You will not be required to remain together while the Court is in recess. It's highly important that you strictly observe the rules that govern you during a recess or adjournment so as to assure the parties of a fair trial by not allowing any outside information or incidents to influence your consideration of this case.

First, do not discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss it with you. Until you retire to the jury room at the end of the case to deliberate on your verdict, you are simply not to talk about the case. If anyone should try to talk to you about it, please bring it to the Court's attention immediately, but do not discuss it with your fellow jurors.

Secondly, do not try to do any research or make any investigation of the case on your own.

Next, please do not talk, whether in or out of the courtroom, with any of the parties or their attorneys or any witnesses. By this, I mean not only do not talk about the case, but do not talk at all even to pass the time of day. In no other way can the parties be assured of the absolute impartiality they're entitled to expect from you as jurors.

I assure you that no one will consider you rude for failing to talk to someone involved in the case. Everyone is bound by the same rule.

And, finally, do not attempt to form any opinion until after all the evidence has been presented. In that way, every party's evidence will receive equal consideration from you.

When you retire to the jury room for you deliberations after the Court has instructed you on the law, then you will fully and freely discuss the evidence so as to arrive at a verdict.

Let me talk with you about the order of proceedings. The trial is going to proceed in the following order. First, the parties have the opportunity to make opening statements. The government will make an opening statement at the beginning of the case. The

defendants may make opening statements following the opening statement for the government, or they can defer the making of opening statements until the close of the government's case. No party is obliged to make an opening statement, and what is said in opening statements is not evidence. These statements simply serve the purpose of introducing the evidence which the party making the statement intends to produce.

Second, the government will introduce evidence in support of the charges contained in the indictment.

Third, after the government has presented its evidence, the defendants will have the option of presenting evidence. Defendant Tyreese Pugh will have the first opportunity to present evidence. Defendant Walter Pugh may then present evidence.

While both defendants may present evidence, neither one of them is obliged to do so. The burden is always on the government to prove every element of the offenses charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The law never imposes on a criminal defendant in a criminal case the burden of calling any witnesses or introducing any evidence.

Fourth, at the conclusion of the evidence, all parties have the opportunity to present oral argument in support of their case. What is said in closing arguments

is not evidence, just as what is said in opening statements is not evidence. The arguments are designed to present to you the contentions of the parties as to what they believe the evidence has shown and what inferences they think you should draw from the evidence. The government has the right to open and close the arguments.

Fifth, I'll instruct you on the applicable law, and you will then retire to consider your verdict. Your verdict must be unanimous.

We will now begin by affording Mr. Thapar an opportunity to make opening statement in which he will explain the issues in the case and summarize the facts that he expects the evidence will show from the government's point of view. When he finishes, Mr. Felson and Mr. Walter Pugh will have an opportunity to present their opening statements.

The opening statements of the parties are not to be considered as evidence in the case or as your instruction on the law, which will come only from me.

Nevertheless, these statements and arguments are intended to help you understand the issues and the evidence to be presented in this case, as well as the positions taken by both sides.

So now I ask that you give Mr. Thapar your close attention as I recognize him for the purpose of making his

I'm going to talk to you for a little bit about what the

evidence in this case will show. The evidence will show on April 24, 2002, in Hamilton, Ohio, two bank tellers and a manager went to work. They went to work at First National Bank of Southwestern Ohio. That's a bank that's placed in a residential community. It's a little unusual. It doesn't have commercial businesses around it, mainly residences and a school. And, ladies and gentlemen, you will hear the bank isn't often very busy, and the tellers and the manager know most people that walk into that bank.

On April 24th, it was a Wednesday, a normal day for the tellers and manager. They showed up at work like they always do, ready to begin the day. And for the first few hours nothing abnormal happened. People came, and people went. They deposited checks and did other things.

Around 2:22, however, that day changed forever.

At 2:22 in the afternoon of Wednesday, April 24, the defendants Walter Pugh and his son Tyreese Pugh walked into that bank. The tellers were shocked. Why were they shocked? The evidence will show that Mr. Walter Pugh came in without a mask but with a handgun. Behind him came Tyreese Pugh, mask down, shotgun in hand.

Tyreese Pugh went over to the manager immediately, took the gun, pulled it up, pointed it at the manager and told him to get down on the ground and not to touch the alarm button, face down. The manager did as he

1 was told.

Walter Pugh went over to the counter where the tellers were. Before they knew what was going on, Walter Pugh was over the counter. He vaulted it, grabbed a trash can and told them to put the money in their drawers in the can. They did as they were told.

Walter Pugh then took one of the tellers by gun pointed at her head to the vault. She was hysterical but did as he told her and put all the money in the vault in the trash can, or everything she could get while she was shaking.

They then left with 150 -- about \$153,000 of that bank's money.

For the next week, ladies and gentlemen, they fled to Georgia. They were there for about a week, and then they returned. And they came back to Ohio together, and they hid out in Mt. Healthy at the house of one of their friends, Cortes Renfro.

And, ladies and gentlemen, on the night they were arrested, the police arrested Walter Pugh when he left the house in a car. They then went into the house to arrest Tyreese Pugh and found him with a shotgun.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the judge has talked to you about the five counts the United States has alleged that the two defendants, the crimes that the two defendants

briefly.

committed. And briefly I want to talk to you about what the evidence will show in relation to those counts, very

At the end of this case, we're going to ask you to convict the defendants on all five counts. First, we're going to ask you to convict them of robbing the First National Bank of Southwestern Ohio. Not only are we going to ask you to convict them of robbing the bank, but we're going to ask you to convict them of conspiring together to rob the bank.

And the evidence will show through a stipulation that the judge will give you that that bank was federally insured by the FDIC.

Next, we are going to ask you to convict both defendants of brandishing firearms during a crime of violence, a federal crime of violence, and that is bank robbery.

Finally, we're going to ask you to convict

Mr. Tyreese Pugh of being a felon in possession of a

firearm that traveled through interstate commerce. And you

will hear through stipulation again that Mr. Tyreese Pugh

is a felon who was convicted of a crime whose sentence

exceeds one year. The importance of that is purely

statutory.

So, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for listening

to me this afternoon, and at the end of the case Ms. Cross 1 2 will get up and ask that you convict the defendants on all 3 five counts. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thapar. 4 5 Mr. Felson, are you prepared to make opening statement at this time? 6 7 MR. FELSON: Yes. THE COURT: All right. We will move the little 8 podium for you. 9 10 MR. FELSON: With no objection, he can leave it 11 here. We're fine with that. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. FELSON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen 14 of the jury. I'm again Ed Felson, and I represent Tyreese 15 Pugh. I'm appointed to represent Tyreese Pugh, but not 16 Walter Pugh. So that's a very important distinction. 17 Walter Pugh represents himself. So, when I speak, I'll be 18 speaking for Tyreese only. 19 Again, this is a bank robbery, and we're not 20 disputing that. We're not disputing there is \$150,000 or 21 so stolen. 22 The government says that Tyreese Pugh was 23 involved in this case, and we're saying he wasn't. He's 24 denied it all along, and that's what the case is about, we 25 have determined.

Now, the state, the government says this is what

3 bank. But it's really important to note, not only what the

the government will show, that Walter Pugh was in that

evidence will show, but what it won't show. In other

5 | words, we're all aware of our government and our

1

2

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6 government's abilities, and we know the government has the

7 ability to have labs they have that can test DNA. They

8 have scientists. We can put a man on the moon. We can

9 | send a space station out into space. And what's important

10 about this case is, with all the sophistication the

11 | government has, that what the evidence won't show is that

12 | there is a hair on this man Tyreese's head that was found

anywhere in or around that bank; a print from this man

14 | Tyreese Pugh's palm, any of his fingers, thumbs, a print

15 | from any -- of his shoes anywhere in this bank. Simply,

16 | there is going to be no evidence presented for that.

There is going to be no evidence presented that any of these clothes, this mask that was apparently worn, was tested, has any of Mr. Pugh's hair on it or any evidence that he wore some kind of a mask or that there was a mask found with his DNA or his hair follicles on it.

There is going to be a lack of evidence that any of his clothes or fibers or hair follicles or prints or anything else was found on any of any money anywhere or any money

allegedly that came from this bank or any of the guns that

they allegedly had that they're allegedly going to show you.

They -- I think they have two cars that they have taken into custody and they have searched and they have search warrants and all this stuff. Well, they're claiming that Tyreese Pugh went somewhere in Atlanta or somewhere in one of these cars. Well, with all their sophistication and with their space stations up there, and we have gone to Mars and all that, they won't be able to put one hair of this man's body, one fingerprint, one piece of fiber of his clothing or anything in any of these cars.

So what you have got is really a lack of evidence. And that's really what the evidence is going to show here, that there just simply isn't any evidence to tie Tyreese to any of these issues that they're saying.

Now, the person wore a mask, so I guess they're saying some kind of eye witness, I guess through the mask or something. I don't know how they're going to place him in there. But the point is our government owes us a duty, and it's the duty to present evidence. And you can only go by what evidence you hear from that chair right over there. And I'm submitting to you that's what the case is about is a lack of evidence, and they won't have any.

And, as you know, he's innocent as he's sitting here. We have to prove nothing. The government has to

```
1
    prove each and every element beyond a reasonable doubt.
 2
     And when you get done hearing the evidence -- this is the
     last time I get to talk to you before closing -- you will
 3
     see that there simply isn't any. Thank you.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Felson.
               Mr. Walter Pugh, would you like to make opening
 6
 7
     statement at this time?
               DEFENDANT W. PUGH: I thought he was going to put
 8
 9
     it there.
10
               THE COURT: We'll be glad to move it. No
11
    problem.
12
               (Moving the podium to the defense table.)
13
               THE COURT: You may proceed.
14
               DEFENDANT W. PUGH: Ladies and gentlemen of the
15
     jury, my name is Walter Pugh, Jr. I am an American
16
     product.
              I been living in America all my life. I did not
17
     rob no bank, and the evidence will show that I did not rob
18
     no bank.
19
               First of all, I'm a little nervous. This is new
20
            This is something new to me. I never practiced the
21
     law before in my life. But you don't need to practice the
22
     law to know when you are wrongfully being accused. When
23
     you know you're wrongly -- when you know that you are
24
    wrongly being accused, you got to stand up for your rights,
25
     stand up to the government and let them know you got
```

something to say.

I got something to say. I got questions to ask.

Why am I being accused wrongly? The reason I have

something to say, I'm not saying that my court-appointed

assistant attorney cannot ask for me, but what I'm saying

is I can ask. I believe I can be a little more effective,

because I will be asking the facts. I will prove with

facts that the evidence that the government have against me

is no evidence. They don't have no evidence.

On April 24, 2002, at 2:21 p.m. a bank was robbed by three black alleged robbers for 153 dollars -- \$153,189. The bank's surveillance camera photographed two of the alleged robbers. A witness observed and gave the best description they could of that getaway car. And the evidence that the prosecution have, the government have against me, will show that I did not rob that bank or no bank.

They have accused me of \$153,189. Where is that money? I don't have it. And the evidence will show. With that in perspective, I ask what -- I plead not guilty, and I ask for your verdict to come back not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pugh.

The government may call its first witness.

MR. THAPAR: Your Honor, at this time the United States calls James Connaughton.

1	(Witness sworn by the courtroom deputy.)
2	THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Thapar.
3	MR. THAPAR: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	How would you like us to exam the witnesses, from
5	counsel table?
6	THE COURT: Yes. Do you want you can either
7	sit or stand, whatever is more comfortable for you. I
8	think it may in part depend on the microphone and if you
9	need it or not.
10	MR. THAPAR: Okay.
11	THE COURT: You're welcome to do either.
12	MR. THAPAR: I think I'm somewhat loud. So it
13	should be all right. Please let me know if you have a
14	problem hearing.
15	JAMES CONNAUGHTON
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. THAPAR:
18	Q. Mr. Connaughton, can you introduce yourself to the
19	jury and spell your last name for the record?
20	A. My name is Jim Connaughton, Co-n-n-a-u-g-h-t-o-n.
21	Q. And where do you work?
22	A. First Financial Company, First Financial Bank now. It
23	was First National Bank of Southwestern Ohio when it was
24	robbed.
25	Q. And how long have you worked there?

- 1 A. Thirty-four years at the bank.
- 2 | Q. And how long -- what branch do you work at?
- 3 A. Now or then?
- 4 Q. Now, yes. Where do you work now?
- 5 A. The Camden Office.
- 6 Q. I want to direct your attention to April 24th of this
- 7 | year if I could. Where did you work then?
- 8 A. The University Office in Hamilton.
- 9 Q. Okay. And that is a branch?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Now, I want to talk to you specifically about some
- 12 exhibits in front of you, okay, if I could. First, I would
- 13 like you to look at Government's Exhibit 1.1. Can you tell
- 14 | me what that is?
- 15 A. That's a photograph of the branch that I worked at.
- 16 THE COURT: What was the number there?
- MR. THAPAR: I'm sorry. 1.1.
- THE COURT: Thank you.
- 19 BY MR. THAPAR:
- 20 | Q. And how do you know that's a photograph of the bank?
- 21 A. Well, I worked there for five years.
- 22 Q. Okay. And is that a true and accurate -- when I say
- 23 | true and accurate, is it altered in any way, or does that
- 24 | look exactly like the bank?
- 25 A. That's exactly like the bank.

	CONNAUGHTON - DIRECT
1	MR. THAPAR: Your Honor, at this time the
2	government would introduce into evidence Government's
3	Exhibit 1.1.
4	THE COURT: Any objection?
5	MR. FELSON: No.
6	DEFENDANT W. PUGH: No, ma'am.
7	THE COURT: Government exhibit 1.1 will be
8	admitted and may be displayed to the jury whenever you
9	wish.
10	MR. THAPAR: Thank you.
11	BY MR. THAPAR:
12	Q. I want to can you, just from pointing up there, or
.13	tell us where the entrance to the bank is there?
14	A. To the right of that tree.
15	Q. Okay. And I'm going to go through those now kind of
16	fast, if it's okay, and just slow me down if you have any
17	questions. But I want to talk about Government Exhibit
18	1.2. Can you tell me what that is?
19	A. That's the front of the bank where I worked.
20	Q. Okay. And how do you know that?
21	A. Like I said, I have worked there for five years.
22	MR. THAPAR: Okay. At this time, we move into
23	evidence 1.2.
24	THE COURT: Any objection to Government Exhibit
25	1.2 being admitted?

1	MR. FELSON: Not from Tyreese Pugh.
2	DEFENDANT W. PUGH: Not from Walter Pugh.
3	THE COURT: All right. Government Exhibit 1.2
4	will be admitted and may be displayed to the jury.
5	I think we're going to make a switch here,
6	Mr. Thapar. We're going to give the witness an additional
7	exhibit book, and we will bring back the colored ones to
8	use on the visualizer for you.
9	BY MR. THAPAR:
10	Q. And is this just the other half of the front of the
11	bank?
12	A. Right.
13	Q. I want to direct your attention to Government Exhibit
14	1.3. What is it?
15	A. Again, it's a picture of the bank from a different
16	angle looking right at the front door.
17	Q. Is it a true and accurate depiction of the bank?
18	A. Yes, it is.
19	MR. THAPAR: At this time, the government would
20	offer Government Exhibit 1.3 into evidence.
21	MR. FELSON: No objection.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Walter Pugh, any objection to
23	Government Exhibit 1.3?
24	DEFENDANT W. PUGH: No, ma'am.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Government Exhibit 1.3 is

- 1 admitted and may be displayed to the jury.
- 2 BY MR. THAPAR:
- 3 Q. Is that the door entrance to the bank?
- 4 A. Right.
- 5 Q. I'll now have you look at Government's Exhibit 1.4.
- 6 What is it?
- 7 A. It's an inside picture. It's the lobby looking
- 8 | towards the teller line.
- 9 Q. Is it a true and accurate depiction of the teller
- 10 | line?
- 11 A. Yes, it is.
- MR. THAPAR: At this time, the government would
- 13 ask Government Exhibit 1.4 be admitted into evidence.
- MR. FELSON: No objection.
- DEFENDANT W. PUGH: No objection.
- 16 THE COURT: All right. Government Exhibit 1.4
- 17 | will be admitted and may be displayed to the jury.
- 18 BY MR. THAPAR:
- 19 Q. Okay. And that is again what, Mr. Connaughton?
- 20 A. That's the lobby, and it's looking towards the teller
- 21 line. The tellers are behind the counter there.
- 22 Q. I'm going to have you look at once at government's
- 23 Exhibits 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 if that's all right. And
- 24 | can you tell the jury what each of those are?
- 25 A. 1.5 is the other end of the teller line and in the

- 1 background is a drive-up window. Again, that's taken from
- 2 | the lobby. 1.6 is a picture of the vault, and to the left
- 3 of that is my office. 1.7 again is a close-up of the
- 4 | vault. 1.8 is the inside of the vault, and there is a door
- 5 | there that separates the first part of the vault to the
- 6 second part where the money is kept.
- 7 Q. And are all these true and accurate depictions of what
- 8 | you told us?
- 9 A. They are true and accurate depictions, right.
- MR. THAPAR: At this time, the government would
- 11 offer Exhibits 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 and 1.8.
- MR. FELSON: No objection.
- DEFENDANT W. PUGH: No objection.
- 14 THE COURT: All right. Government Exhibits 1.5,
- 15 | 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 will be admitted and may be displayed to
- 16 | the jury.
- 17 BY MR. THAPAR:
- 18 Q. I want to show you Government Exhibit 2. Can you tell
- 19 | me what that is?
- 20 | A. That's a diagram of the branch itself with all the
- 21 rooms broken down.
- 22 Q. And is that a true and accurate depiction of the
- 23 branch?
- 24 A. It is.
- MR. THAPAR: At this time, the government would

	CONNAUGHTON - DIRECT
1	offer Government Exhibit 2.
2	THE COURT: Any objection?
3	MR. FELSON: No.
4	DEFENDANT W. PUGH: No, ma'am.
5	THE COURT: Government Exhibit 2 will be admitted
6	and may be displayed to the jury.
7	MR. THAPAR: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	BY MR. THAPAR:
9	Q. Mr. Connaughton, I want to talk to you now about April
10	24, 2002, and I want to direct your attention to about 2:20
11	in the afternoon. Were you working on that day at that
12	time?
13	A. Yes, I was.
14	Q. What was your position?
15	A. I am the branch officer manager.
16	Q. Did anything unusual happen on that day around that
17	time?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what
20	happened?
21	A. Well, I'm sitting in my office doing some paperwork,
22	and all of a sudden hear this loud people yelling.
23	Those two men came through the front door yelling. One of
24	them jumped up on top of the counter, and he had a gun.
25	And the other one was walking real fast towards me. And I

CONNAUGHTON - DIRECT

had my hand on the button ready to sound the alarm, and he told me to get my hand off the alarm, which I did. Then he instructed me to lay flat down looking at the ground with my hands straight out. So I did that. He told me not to move. He stood there, as far as I know -- I couldn't see -- but he stood there, because every now and then he would tell me don't move.

The other gentleman -- the tellers were kind of screaming. They were kind hysterical. And I could hear one of the tellers crying and screaming. I could tell that she was inside the vault. So the other gentleman or guy took her into the vault. There was still a lot of crying going on. She was nervous. She had trouble doing what he said. A couple times the guy that was on me says "Hurry up. The mailman's coming." I believe he said that two different times. At one time, I felt the gun resting on my shoulder.

When they were finished, he told all of us to don't move for 20 seconds. When I heard them go out the door -- Q. I'm going to stop you there. I'm sorry. I want to go back and cover a few things, and then we'll talk about what happened after they left, if that's okay.

The gentleman that came over to you, can you describe him for us to the best of your ability?

A. I could tell that he was black. He had a shotgun